



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/734,481	12/12/2003	William Ho Chang	1282-020/MMM	9600
21034	7590	01/06/2009		
IPSOLON LLP 111 SW COLUMBIA SUITE 710 PORTLAND, OR 97201			EXAMINER JOO, JOSHUA	
			ART UNIT 2454	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/06/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/734,481

Applicant(s)

CHANG, WILLIAM HO

Examiner

JOSHUA JOO

Art Unit

2454

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 October 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-13, 15, 19-21, 23, 25-30, 33, 37, 39-45 and 47-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-13, 15, 19-21, 23, 25-30, 33, 37, 39-45 and 47-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12/13/03 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-846)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 09/24/08
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Detailed Action

1. This Office action is in response to Applicant's communication dated 10/23/2008.
Claims 1-4, 6-13, 15, 19-21, 23, 25-30, 33, 37, 39-45, 47-51 are pending for examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4, 6-13, 15, 19-21, 23, 25-30, 33, 37, 39-45, 47-51 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. New ground(s) of rejection are necessitated by Applicant's amendment.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted 09/24/2008 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the Examiner.

Claim Objections

4. There is no claim 46. The claims are not numbered consecutively.
5. Claims 1-4, 6-13, 15, 39-45, 47-50 are objected to because of the following informalities:
 - i) Regarding claim 1, "the private area" should be changed to "private memory area".
 - ii) Regarding claim 13, "the protected software" should be changed to "the protected computer software".
 - iii) Regarding claim 39, "the wireless communication component" should be changed to "the wireless component" or "a wireless component" changed to "a wireless communication component".
 - iv) Regarding claims 1 and 39, "the private area" should be changed to "private memory area" and "the USB interface" to "the USB device interface".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 39-45, 47-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- i) Regarding claim 39, it is unclear as to which feature “it” is referring to in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1, 3, 9, 19-20, 23, 27, 39, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizutani et al. US Patent #6,603,744 (Mizutani hereinafter), in view of Genske et al. US Publication #2002/0065872 (Genske hereinafter), Luu et al. US Patent #6,948,165 (Luu hereinafter), and Hancock et al. US Patent #6,202,023 (Hancock hereinafter).
10. As per claim 1, Mizutani teaches substantially the invention as claimed including a portable wireless communication device, connectable to a computing device, comprising:
- a device interface connectable to an external interface of a computing device (col. 7, lines 43-45. Wireless hub connected to computer.);

a wireless communication component for enabling wireless radio frequency communication (col. 8, lines 1-7. Wireless transceiver sends wireless packets.);

a memory controller for managing communication with the device interface (col. 8, lines 2-9. Control unit receives data and controls transmission of data.),

whereby the portable wireless communication device provides the computing device with wireless access through the wireless communication component (col. 8, lines 1-7. Wireless transceiver sends wireless packets.).

11. Mizutani teaches of software to enable the radio frequency communication at the computing device but does not specifically teach a private memory component that includes a private area not accessible or viewable by a user, the private memory area storing protected computer software, the protected computer software being installable and executable at the computing device to enable the radio frequency communication at the computing device; the memory controller providing an autorun operation that includes obtaining the protected computer software from the private area, and the memory controller facilitating automatic installation of protected computer software on the computing device, whereby the portable wireless communication device launches the protected computer software thereon upon connecting the portable wireless communication to the computing device, and whereby the wireless access is wireless Internet access.

12. Genske teaches of a device comprising computer software being installable and executable at a computing device; and a memory controller providing an autorun operation that includes obtaining the computer software and facilitating automatic installation of computer software on the computing device, whereby the device launches the computer software thereon upon connecting the device to the computing device (Paragraphs 0011; 0029).

13. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for a device to comprise computer software being installable and executable; a

memory controller to provide an autorun operation that includes obtaining the computer software; and for the memory controller to facilitate automatic installation of computer software on the computing device as taught by Genske in order to enable the radio frequency communication at the computing device as taught by Mizutani. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Genske's teachings would improve Mizutani's teachings by enabling communication between a client and a host in an automated manner (Paragraph 0011).

14. Mizutani and Genske do not specifically teach a private memory component that includes a private area not accessible or viewable by a user, the private memory area storing the protected computer software.

15. Luu teaches of a private memory component that includes a private area not accessible or viewable by a user, wherein the private memory area stores protected computer software, and wherein the protected computer software is obtained from the private memory area for installing at a computing device (col. 3, lines 44-54).

16. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the computer software as taught by the suggested system to be protected and stored in a private area that is not accessible or viewable by a user as taught by Luu. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Luu's teachings would improve the suggested system by enabling installation of a program without user participation (col. 1, lines 31-34) and enabling protection of files.

17. Hank teaches of a wireless transceiver that provides wireless Internet access (col. 25, lines 1-7, 15-22).

18. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the wireless communication device as taught by the suggested system to provide wireless Internet access. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Hank's teachings

would improve the suggested system by providing services over an Internet for users and providing information that is specific to a user's location (col. 2, lines 62-67).

19. As per claim 19, Mizutani teaches substantially the invention as claimed including a portable wireless communication device, connectable to a computing device, comprising:

a device interface connectable to an external interface of the computing device (col. 7, lines 43-

49. Wireless hub connected to computer. USB interface unit.);

a wireless communication component for enabling wireless radio frequency communication (col. 8, lines 1-7. Wireless transceiver sends wireless packets.);

a memory component having a public area that is accessible and viewable by a user for storage (col. 7, lines 4-11. Processing can be stored in memory.); and

a memory controller for managing communication through the device interface (col. 8, lines 2-9. Control unit receives data and controls transmission of data.).

20. Mizutani teaches of providing the computing device with wireless access through the wireless communication component but does not specifically teach a private area storing therein a protected computer software that is operable to be automatically installed and executed on the computing device upon connecting the device interface to the external interface of the computing device; and a controller for accessing component that includes the private area.

21. Genske teaches of a client device comprising memory for storing computer software that is operable to be automatically installed and executed at a computing device upon connecting a device interface to the external interface of a computing device (Paragraphs 0011; 0029).

22. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for a device as taught by Mizutani to comprise memory for storing computer software that is operable to be automatically installed and executed at a computing device upon

connecting a device interface to the external interface of a computing device as taught by Genske. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Genske's teachings would improve Mizutani's teachings by enabling communication between a client and a host in an automated manner (Paragraph 0011).

23. Mizutani and Genske do not specifically teach a private area storing that stores protected software.

24. Luu teaches of a private memory component having a private area storing protected computer software (col. 3, lines 44-54).

25. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the computer software as taught by the suggested system to be protected and stored in a private area as taught by Luu. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Luu's teachings would improve the suggested system by enabling installation of a program without user participation (col. 1, lines 31-34) and enabling protection of files.

26. Hank teaches of a wireless transceiver that provides wireless Internet access (col. 25, lines 1-7, 15-22).

27. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the wireless communication device as taught by the suggested system to provide wireless Internet access. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Hank's teachings would improve the suggested system by providing services over an Internet for users and providing information that is specific to a user's location (col. 2, lines 62-67).

28. As per claim 39, Mizutani teaches substantially the invention as claimed including a portable wireless communication device subcombination, comprising:

a USB device interface for connecting to a computing device (col. 7, lines 43-49. Wireless hub connected to computer. USB interface unit.);

a hub with one or more ports, including a port for connecting with a wireless component, the wireless communication enabling wireless radio frequency communication (col. 8, lines 1-7. Wireless transceiver sends wireless packets.);

a memory controller that is executable to: managing communication with the hub and the USB interface.

29. Mizutani teaches of providing wireless access to a computing device but does not specifically teach a memory component storing protected computer software within a private memory area that is not accessible or viewable by a user, the computer software being installable and executable on the computing device to provide it with wireless Internet access upon connecting the portable wireless communication device with the computing device; and a processor that is executable facilitate an autorun operation for automatically launching and installing on the computing device the protected computer software upon connecting the USB interface to the computing device, and access the protected computer software in the private area of the memory component.

30. Genske teaches of a client device comprising memory for storing computer software that is installable and executable at a computing device; a processor providing an autorun operation for automatically launching and installing the computer software on the computing device, whereby the device launches the computer software thereon upon connecting the device to the computing device (Paragraphs 0011; 0029).

31. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for a device as taught by Mizutani to comprise memory for storing computer software that is installable and executable at a computing device; a processor that is executable to facilitate an autorun operation for automatic launching and installing the computer software upon

connecting the device to the computing device as taught by Genske. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Genske's teachings would improve Mizutani's teachings by enabling communication between a client and a host in an automated manner (Paragraph 0011).

32. Mizutani and Genske do not specifically teach a private memory component that includes a private area not accessible or viewable by a user, wherein the private memory area stores protected computer software.

33. Luu teaches of a private memory component that includes a private area not accessible or viewable by a user, wherein the private memory area stores protected computer software, and wherein the protected computer software is obtained from the private memory area for installing at a computing device (col. 3, lines 44-54).

34. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the computer software as taught by the suggested system to be protected and stored in a private area not accessible or viewable by a user as taught by Luu. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Luu's teachings would improve the suggested system by enabling installation of a program without user participation (col. 1, lines 31-34) and enabling protection of files.

35. Hank teaches of a wireless transceiver that provides wireless Internet access (col. 25, lines 1-7, 15-22).

36. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the wireless communication device as taught by the suggested system to provide wireless Internet access. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Hank's teachings would improve the suggested system by providing services over an Internet for users and providing information that is specific to a user's location (col. 2, lines 62-67).

37. As per claim 3, Mizutani teaches the communication device of claim 1 in which a memory component includes a memory section in which is stored code for operating the memory controller (col. 7, lines 4-11. Processing may be stored in memory.). Mizutani does not specifically teach a private memory component includes a first memory section in which is stored the protected computer software.

38. Luu teaches of a private memory component in which is stored the protected computer software (col. 3, lines 44-54).

39. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to implement a private memory component in which is stored the protected computer software and for the private memory component as taught by Luu to store code for operating the memory controller. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Luu's teachings would improve the suggested system by enabling installation of a program without user participation (col. 1, lines 31-34) and enabling protection of files.

40. As per claim 9, Mizutani teaches the communication device of claim 1 in which the device interface corresponds to a universal serial bus interface (col. 7, lines 47-49. USB.).

41. As per claim 20, Mizutani does not specifically teach the communication device of claim 19 in which the memory component further stores at least part of an autorun software that is operable to install and execute the protected computer software application on the computing device automatically upon connection of the device interface to the external interface of the computing device.

42. Genske teaches of a device comprising memory for storing an autorun software that is operable to install and execute software on the computing device automatically upon connecting the device to the external interface computing device (Paragraphs 0011; 0029).

43. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for a device as taught by Mizutani to comprise memory for storing an autorun software that is operable to install and execute software on the computing device automatically upon connecting the device to the external interface computing device as taught by Genske. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Genske's teachings would improve Mizutani's teachings by enabling communication between a client and a host in an automated manner (Paragraph 0011).

44. As per claim 23, Mizutani teaches the communication device of claim 19 in which a memory component includes a memory section in which is stored code for operating the memory controller (col. 7, lines 4-11. Processing may be stored in memory.). Mizutani does not specifically teach a private memory component includes a first memory section in which is stored the protected computer software.

45. Luu teaches of a private memory component in which is stored the protected computer software (col. 3, lines 44-54).

46. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to implement a private memory component in which is stored the protected computer software and for the private memory component as taught by Luu to store code for operating the memory controller. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Luu's teachings would improve the suggested system by enabling installation of a program without user participation (col. 1, lines 31-34) and enabling protection of files.

47. As per claim 27, Mizutani teaches the communication device of claim 19 in which the device interface corresponds to a universal serial bus interface (col. 7, lines 47-49. USB.).

48. As per claim 41, Mizutani teaches the subcombination of claim 39 in which a memory component includes a memory section in which is stored code for operating the memory controller (col. 7, lines 4-11. Processing may be stored in memory.). Mizutani does not specifically teach a private memory component includes a first memory section in which is stored the protected computer software.

49. Luu teaches of a private memory component in which is stored the protected computer software (col. 3, lines 44-54).

50. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to implement a private memory component in which is stored the protected computer software and for the private memory component as taught by Luu to store code for operating the memory controller. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Luu's teachings would improve the suggested system by enabling installation of a program without user participation (col. 1, lines 31-34) and enabling protection of files.

51. Claims 2 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizutani, Genske, Luu, and Hancock, in view of Iida et al. US Patent #6,772,233 (Iida hereinafter).

52. As per claim 2, Mizutani teaches the communication device of claim 1 further including a file storage memory segment to store data content (col. 8, lines 1-4. Buffer to store content.). Mizutani does not specifically teach the file storage memory segment being accessible by the computing device.

53. Iida teaches of a communication device comprising a file storage segment accessible by a computing device to store data content (col. 8, lines 2-6, 10-19, 51-56; col. 9, lines 8-13).

54. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the communication device as taught by the suggested system to comprise a file storage segment accessible by a computing device to store data content. The motivation for the

suggested combination is that Iida's teachings would improve the suggested system by allowing a user to conveniently receive information from a network and store data independent of a computer (col. 2, lines 30-37; col. 8, lines 54-58).

55. As per claim 40, Mizutani teaches the subcombination of claim 39 in which a memory component further includes a file storage memory segment to store data content (col. 8, lines 1-4. Buffer to store content.). Mizutani does not specifically teach the file storage memory segment being accessible by the computing device.

56. Iida teaches of a communication device comprising a file storage segment accessible by a computing device to store data content (col. 8, lines 2-6, 10-19, 51-56; col. 9, lines 8-13).

57. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the subcombination as taught by the suggested system to comprise a file storage segment accessible by a computing device to store data content. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Iida's teachings would improve the suggested system by allowing a user to conveniently receive information from a network and store data independent of a computer (col. 2, lines 30-37; col. 8, lines 54-58).

58. Claims 4, 21, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizutani, Genske, Luu, and Hancock, in view of Kusada et al. US Publication #2002/0083430 (Kusada hereinafter).

59. As per claim 4, Mizutani does not specifically teach the communication device of claim 1 in which the protected computer software is further operable to be uninstalled from the computing device automatically upon disconnection of the device interface from the external interface of the computing device.

60. Kusada teaches of software to automatically uninstall software from an apparatus upon disconnection of a device interface from an external interface of the apparatus (Paragraphs 0009; 0093-0094).

61. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the protected computer software application as taught by the suggested system to comprise software operable to be uninstalled automatically upon disconnection of a device as taught by Kusada. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Kusada's teachings would allow removal of unused software without user action, which would increase memory space for the computing device.

62. As per claim 21, Mizutani does not specifically teach the communication device of claim 20 in which one of the autorun software and the protected computer software application is further operable to uninstall at least part of the protected computer software application from the computing device automatically upon disconnection of the device interface from the external interface of the computing device.

63. Kusada teaches of software operable to uninstall software on an apparatus automatically upon disconnection of a device interface from the external interface of the apparatus (Paragraphs 0009; 0093-0094).

64. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the autorun software and protected computer software application as taught by the suggested system to comprise software that is operable to uninstall at least part of the protected computer software application from the device automatically upon disconnection of the device interface from the external interface of the device as taught by Kusada. The motivation for the suggested

combination is that Kusada's teachings would allow removal of unused software without user action, which would increase memory space for the computing device.

65. As per claim 42, Mizutani does not specifically teach the subcombination of claim 39 in which the protected computer software is further operable to be uninstalled from the computing device automatically upon disconnection of the device interface from the external interface of the computing device.

66. Kusada teaches of to automatically uninstall software from an apparatus upon disconnection of a device interface from an external interface of the apparatus (Paragraphs 0009; 0093-0094).

67. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the protected computer software application as taught by the suggested system to comprise software to automatically uninstall software application from the computer upon disconnection from the device as taught by Kusada. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Kusada's teachings would allow removal of unused software without user action, which would increase memory space for the computing device.

68. Claims 6, 25, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizutani, Genske, Luu, and Hancock, in view of Hosogaya, US Publication #2002/0065098 (Hosogaya hereinafter).

69. As per claim 6, Mizutani does not specifically teach the communication device of claim 1 further comprising a user-operable external switch to provide user control of activation and deactivation of the wireless communication component.

70. Hosogaya teaches of a user-operable external switch to provide user control of activation and deactivation of the wireless communication component (Paragraphs 0026; 0038).

71. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the communication device as taught by the suggested system to comprise a user-operable external switch to provide user control of activation and deactivation of the wireless communication component. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Hosogaya's teachings would improve the suggested system by allowing a user to save power on the communication device when the user does not use the communication device and allowing control of electromagnetic radiation (Paragraph 0010).

72. As per claim 25, Mizutani does not specifically teach the communication device of claim 19 further comprising a user-operable external switch to provide user control of activation and deactivation of the wireless communication component.

73. Hosogaya teaches of a user-operable external switch to provide user control of activation and deactivation of the wireless communication component (Paragraphs 0026; 0038).

74. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the communication device as taught by the suggested system to comprise a user-operable external switch to provide user control of activation and deactivation of the wireless communication component. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Hosogaya's teachings would improve the suggested system by allowing a user to save power on the communication device when the user does not use the communication device and allowing control of electromagnetic radiation (Paragraph 0010).

75. As per claim 43, Mizutani does not specifically teach the subcombination of claim 39 further comprising a user-operable external switch to provide user control of activation and deactivation of the wireless communication component.

76. Hosogaya teaches of a user-operable external switch to provide user control of activation and deactivation of the wireless communication component (Paragraphs 0026; 0038).

77. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the subcombination as taught by the suggested system to comprise a user-operable external switch to provide user control of activation and deactivation of the wireless communication component. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Hosogaya's teachings would improve the suggested system by allowing a user to save power on the communication device when the user does not use the communication device and allowing control of electromagnetic radiation (Paragraph 0010).

78. Claims 7-8, 26, 37, 44, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizutani, Genske, Luu, and Hancock, in view of Weiser et al. US Patent #5,982,520 (Weiser hereinafter).

79. As per claim 7, Mizutani does not specifically teach the communication device of claim 1 further comprising a battery for powering the communication device without connection to the computing device so that the communication device is operable to receive data content via wireless communication.

80. Weiser teaches of a communication device comprising a battery for powering the communication device without connection to the computing device so that the communication device is operable to receive data content via wireless communication (col. 5, lines 1-4. Battery. col. 4, lines 44-53. Device(s) is able to wirelessly transfer information to the personal storage device.).

81. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the communication device as taught by the suggested system to comprise a battery for powering the communication device without connection to the computing device so that the communication device is operable to receive data content via wireless communication as taught by

Weiser. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Weiser's teachings would improve the suggested system by enabling the communication device to be portable and provide wireless receiving and sending of data (col. 2, lines 24-27, 41-49).

82. As per claim 8, Mizutani does not specifically teach the communication device of claim 7 further comprising a user-operable external switch to provide user control of operation of the communication device without connection to the computing device.

83. Weiser teaches of a communication device comprising a user-operable external switch to provide user control of operation of the communication device without connection to a computing device (col. 4, lines 19-20. Input buttons. col. 6, lines 21-25).

84. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the communication device as taught by the suggested system to comprise a user-operable external switch to provide user control of operation of the communication device without connection to a computing device as taught by Weiser. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Weiser's teachings would improve the suggested system by enabling user control of the communication device and enabling the communication device to wirelessly receive and send data (col. 2, lines 24-27, 41-49).

85. As per claim 26, Mizutani does not specifically teach the communication device of claim 19 further comprising a user-operable external switch to provide user control of a battery powered operation of the communication device.

86. Weiser teaches of a communication device comprising a user-operable external switch to provide user control of a battery powered operation of the communication device (col. 5, lines 1-4. Battery. col. 4, lines 19-20. Input buttons. col. 6, lines 21-25).

87. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the communication device as taught by the suggested system to comprise a user-operable external switch to provide user control of a battery powered operation of the communication device as taught by Weiser. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Weiser's teachings would improve the suggested system by enabling user control of the communication device and enabling the communication device to wirelessly receive and send data (col. 2, lines 24-27, 41-49).

88. As per claim 37, Mizutani does not specifically teach the communication device of claim 19 further comprising a battery to provide battery powered operation of the communication device.

89. Weiser teaches of a communication device comprising a battery to provide battery powered operation of the communication device (col. 5, lines 1-4. Battery. col. 4, lines 19-20. Input buttons. col. 6, lines 21-25).

90. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the communication device as taught by the suggested system to comprise a battery to provide battery powered operation of the communication device as taught by Weiser. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Weiser's teachings would improve the suggested system by enabling the communication device to be portable and provide wireless receiving and sending of data (col. 2, lines 24-27, 41-49).

91. As per claim 44, Mizutani does not specifically teach the subcombination of claim 39 further comprising a battery for powering the communication device without connection to the computing device so that the communication device is operable to receive data content via wireless communication.

92. Weiser teaches of a communication device comprising a battery for powering the communication device without connection to the computing device so that the communication device is operable to receive data content via wireless communication (col. 5, lines 1-4. Battery. col. 4, lines 44-53. Device(s) is able to wirelessly transfer information to the personal storage device.).

93. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the subcombination as taught by the suggested system to comprise a battery for powering the communication device without connection to the computing device so that the communication device is operable to receive data content via wireless communication as taught by Weiser. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Weiser's teachings would improve the suggested system by enabling the communication device to be portable and provide wireless receiving and sending of data (col. 2, lines 24-27, 41-49).

94. As per claim 45, Mizutani does not specifically teach the subcombination of claim 39 further comprising a user-operable external switch to provide user control of operation of the communication device without connection to the computing device.

95. Weiser teaches of a communication device comprising a user-operable external switch to provide user control of operation of the communication device without connection to a computing device (col. 4, lines 19-20. Input buttons. col. 6, lines 21-25).

96. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the subcombination as taught by the suggested system to comprise a user-operable external switch to provide user control of operation of the communication device without connection to a computing device as taught by Weiser. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Weiser's teachings would improve the suggested system by enabling user control of the

communication device and enabling the communication device to wirelessly receive and send data (col. 2, lines 24-27, 41-49).

97. Claims 10 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizutani, Genske, Luu, and Hancock, in view of Fisher et al. US Publication #2004/0095382 (Fisher hereinafter).

98. As per claim 10, Mizutani does not specifically teach the communication device of claim 1 in which the device interface corresponds to one of a Firewire format, a Compact Flash format, and a Secure Digital format.

99. Fisher teaches of a portable memory device that connects to a computer, wherein an interface of the device may correspond to a Firewire format (Paragraphs 0024; 0038).

100. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the device interface as taught by Mizutani to correspond to a Firewire format as taught by Fisher. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Fisher's teachings would improve the suggested system by providing an interface that is an industry standard, thus well known and accepted. Furthermore, alternative/additional interfaces would provide a suitable interface to allow the device to connect to the computer.

101. As per claim 28, Mizutani does not specifically teach the communication device of claim 19 in which the device interface does not correspond to a universal serial bus interface.

102. Fisher teaches of a portable memory device that connects to a computer, wherein an interface of the device may correspond to a Firewire format (Paragraphs 0024; 0038).

103. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the device interface as taught by Mizutani to correspond to a Firewire format

as taught by Fisher. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Fisher's teachings would improve the suggested system by providing an interface that is an industry standard, thus well known and accepted. Furthermore, alternative/additional interfaces would provide a suitable interface to allow the device to connect to the computer.

104. Claims 11, 12, 29-30, 47, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizutani, Genske, Luu, and Hancock, in view of Peters, US Patent #7,149,834 (Peters hereinafter).

105. As per claim 11, Mizutani does not specifically teach the communication device of claim 1 in which the wireless communication corresponds to a Bluetooth standard of wireless communication.

106. Peters teaches of a communication device in which a wireless communication corresponds to a Bluetooth standard of wireless communication (col. 2, lines 39-55. Bluetooth.).

107. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the communication in which a wireless communication as taught by the suggested system to correspond to a Bluetooth standard of wireless communication as taught by Peters. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Peters' teachings would improve the suggested system by providing a wireless protocol that allows simple interconnection using short range wireless connection and enabling communication with low power consumption.

108. As per claim 12, Mizutani does not specifically teach the communication device of claim 1 in which the wireless communication corresponds to one of a IEEE802.11 a, IEEE802.11b, IEEE802.11g, IEEE802.11f, IEEE802.15, or IEEE802.17 standard of wireless communication.

109. Peters teaches of a communication device in which a wireless communication corresponds to one of a IEEE802.11 a, IEEE802.11b, IEEE802.11g, IEEE802.11f, IEEE802.15, or IEEE802.17 standard of wireless communication (col. 2, lines 39-55).

110. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the communication in which a wireless communication as taught by the suggested system to one of a IEEE802.11 a, IEEE802.11b, IEEE802.11g, IEEE802.11f, IEEE802.15, or IEEE802.17 standard of wireless communication as taught by Peters. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Peters' teachings would improve the suggested system by providing a wireless protocol that allows simple interconnection using short range wireless connection and enabling communication with low power consumption.

111. As per claim 29, Mizutani does not specifically teach the communication device of claim 19 in which the wireless communication corresponds to a Bluetooth standard of wireless communication.

112. Peters teaches of a communication device in which a wireless communication corresponds to a Bluetooth standard of wireless communication (col. 2, lines 39-55, Bluetooth.).

113. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the communication device in which the wireless communication as taught by the suggested system to correspond to a Bluetooth standard of wireless communication as taught by Peters. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Peters' teachings would improve the suggested system by providing a wireless protocol that allows simple interconnection using short range wireless connection and enabling communication with low power consumption.

114. As per claim 30, Mizutani does not specifically teach the communication device of claim 19 in which the wireless communication corresponds to one that is compatible to one of operating in IEEE 802.11 standard of wireless communication.

115. Peters teaches of a communication device, in which wireless communication corresponds to the IEEE 802.11 standard of wireless communication (col. 2, lines 39-55. IEEE 802.11).

116. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the communication device in which the wireless communication as taught by the suggested system to correspond to a IEEE 802.11 standard of wireless communication as taught by Peters. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Peters' teachings would improve the suggested system by allowing communication using an alternative wireless communications protocol that is widely used and provides management of packet traffic.

117. As per claim 47, Mizutani does not specifically teach the subcombination of claim 39 in which the wireless communication corresponds to a Bluetooth standard of wireless communication.

118. Peters teaches of a communication device in which a wireless communication corresponds to a Bluetooth standard of wireless communication (col. 2, lines 39-55. Bluetooth.).

119. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the subcombination in which a wireless communication as taught by the suggested system to correspond to a Bluetooth standard of wireless communication as taught by Peters. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Peters' teachings would improve the suggested system by providing a wireless protocol that allows simple interconnection using short range wireless connection and enabling communication with low power consumption.

120. As per claim 48, Mizutani does not specifically teach the subcombination of claim 39 in which the wireless communication corresponds to one of a IEEE802.11 a, IEEE802.11b, IEEE802.11g, IEEE802.11f, IEEE802.15, or IEEE802.17 standard of wireless communication.

121. Peters teaches of a communication device in which a wireless communication corresponds to one of a IEEE802.11 a, IEEE802.11b, IEEE802.11g, IEEE802.11f, IEEE802.15, or IEEE802.17 standard of wireless communication (col. 2, lines 39-55).

122. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the subcombination in which a wireless communication as taught by the suggested system to correspond to one of a IEEE802.11 a, IEEE802.11b, IEEE802.11g, IEEE802.11f, IEEE802.15, or IEEE802.17 standard of wireless communication as taught by Peters. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Peters' teachings would improve the suggested system by providing a wireless protocol that allows simple interconnection using short range wireless connection and enabling communication with low power consumption.

123. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizutani, Genske, Luu, and Hancock, in view of Motoyama, US Patent #7,136,914 (Motoyama hereinafter).

124. As per claim 13, Mizutani does not specifically teach the communication device of claim 1 in which the protected software further providing data output service that includes one or more of printing, displaying, projecting and audio output of data content to one or more output device associated with the computing device.

125. Motoyama teaches of a system for connecting devices wirelessly, wherein a computer may output data to one or more printers (col. 3, lines 62-65; col. 4, line 64-col. 5, line 4).

126. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the protected software further as taught by the suggested system to provide data output service that includes one or more of printing to one or more output device associated with the computing device. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Motoyama's teachings would improve the suggested system by allowing a user to print texts and images on a printing medium.

127. Claims 15, 33, and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizutani, Genske, Luu, and Hancock, in view of Neves et al. US Publication #2002/0032855 (Neves hereinafter).

128. As per claim 15, Mizutani does not specifically teach the invention of claim 1, in which the device is configured as a dongle.

129. Neves teaches of a communication device, in which the device is configured as a dongle (Paragraph 0043).

130. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the communication device as taught by the suggested system to be configured as a dongle. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Neves' teachings would improve the suggested system by providing a small device that enables wireless access.

131. As per claim 33, Mizutani does not specifically teach the invention of claim 19, in which the device is configured as a dongle.

132. Neves teaches of a communication device, in which the device is configured as a dongle (Paragraph 0043).

133. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the communication device as taught by the suggested system to be

configured as a dongle. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Neves' teachings would improve the suggested system by providing a small device that enables wireless access.

134. As per claim 49, Mizutani does not specifically teach the subcombination of claim 49, in which the device is configured as a dongle.

135. Neves teaches of a communication device, in which the device is configured as a dongle (Paragraph 0043).

136. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the subcombination as taught by the suggested system to be configured as a dongle. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Neves' teachings would improve the suggested system by providing a small device that enables wireless access.

137. Claims 50 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizutani, Genske, Luu, and Hancock, in view of Koretsky et al. US Publication #2004/0070379 (Koretsky hereinafter).

138. As per claim 50, Mizutani does not specifically teach the communication device of claim 1 in which the wireless communication component further includes a radio and a baseband controller for enabling wireless radio frequency communication.

139. Koretsky teaches of a wireless communication component that includes a radio and a baseband controller for enabling wireless radio frequency communication (Paragraph 0011; fig. 5).

140. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the wireless communication component as taught by the suggested system to further include a radio and a baseband controller for enabling wireless radio frequency communication as

taught by Silvester. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Koretsky's teachings would improve the suggested system by providing supervision in digital data processing required for radio transmission.

141. As per claim 51, Mizutani does not specifically the subcombination of claim 19 in which the wireless communication component further includes a radio and a baseband controller for enabling wireless radio frequency communication.

142. Koretsky teaches of a wireless communication component that includes a radio and a baseband controller for enabling wireless radio frequency communication (Paragraph 0011; fig. 5).

143. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the wireless communication component as taught by the suggested system to further include a radio and a baseband controller for enabling wireless radio frequency communication as taught by Silvester. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Koretsky's teachings would improve the suggested system by providing supervision in digital data processing required for radio transmission.

Conclusion

144. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

145. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH

shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

146. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua Joo whose telephone number is 571 272-3966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 7 to 4.

147. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J. Flynn can be reached on 571 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

148. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/J. J./
Examiner, Art Unit 2454

/Nathan J. Flynn/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2454